DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 818 FL 020 637

AUTHOR Popkewitz, Thomas S.
TITLE A Political/Sociological Critique of Teacher Education Reforms: Evaluation of the Relation of Power and Knowledge.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 29p.; In: Focus on Evaluation and Measurement. Volumes 1 and 2. Proceedings of the National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues (2nd, Washington, DC, September 4-6, 1991); see FL 020 630.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the promise and limitations of evaluation in teacher education in the context of reform. The promise of evaluation is to understand the diverse issues and complexities that underlie the processes of reform and to contribute to a more informed policy making. Three themes in teacher education evaluation are considered. These include: (1) social production and social reception of policy; (2) styles of reasoning and constructing the subject: discourse and power; and (3) tensions in the relation of state and teacher education: a problematic for evaluation. Recent studies of teacher education and teaching provide illustrations of the relation of reform, knowledge, and power. (VWL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

# A Political/Sociological Critique of Teacher Education Reforms: Evaluation of the Relation of Power and Knowledge[1]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Thomas S. Popkewitz
The University of Wisconsin-Madison

ED349818

The last decade has seen a resurgence of interest in the problem of educational change. School reform is viewed as a mechanism to achieve economic revival, cultural transformation, national solidarity, and ethnic aspirations. An important part of the reforms concern the improvement of teaching and teacher education. The impetus for change has come from multiple sources: Federal and state governmental and philanthropic reports have focused on the quality of teaching, university curriculum, and student achievement. Legislation has increased the state's direct control over the policy and content of teacher education. A professional infrastructure has supported new programs and standards as ways to alter occupational practices, to increase teachers' remuneration, and to improve the quality of teaching. Central to the literature is a call for more educational research and professionalism among teachers.

Current reform practices should be viewed as an integral element of the events and structured arrangements of schooling. As a primary institution for establishing direction, purpose, and will in society, schooling ties polity, culture, economy, and the modern state to the cognitive and motivating patterns of the individual.[2] Educational reform does not merely transmit information on new practice. Defined as part of the social relations of schooling, reform can be considered a strategic site in which social regulation occurs and power relations are embodied.

It is within this context that I wish to explore the promise and limitations of evaluation in teacher education. The promise of evaluation is to understand the diverse issues and complexities that underlie the processes of reform; and to contribute to a more informed policy making. This focus is important to all who wish to promote intellectual integrity and social equality in schooling. The importance of evaluation is revealed through recent social theory and methodology which highlight the ways in which the categories, distinctions, and differences produced in social research establish social interests and power relations (see, e.g., Bourdieu, 1984; Cherryholmes, 1988; Clifford, 1988). Since evaluations are typically commissioned by those with power but in the name of a common good, the social values and relations that underlie research are important to consider.

FL 020 637



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Three themes in teacher education evaluation are considered. The first two themes are a cautionary tale about evaluation -- evaluation is produced in social fields in which people vie for authority. These themes focus on the power relations "carried" as the problems and strategies of evaluation are constructed.

1. Evaluation needs to consider issues of social production and the social realization of policy. This entails two dimensions. Evaluation is a state strategy to produce social amelioration. State is used as a theoretical category to explore how the larger concerns of social regulation and steering of institutions are carried into the daily life and practices of schooling and teacher education. The strategies applied, the categories and distinctions that construct the reforms, and the social contexts of teacher education and schooling interact to produce social values and power relations.

2. The distinctions, categories, and differences embodied in evaluation are not neutral terms to describe events; they are modes of presentation and styles of reasoning that construct the subject; tying discourse to issues of power. Words which have currency in evaluation (e.g., measurement, assessment, professionalization, empowerment, and site-based management) have no fixed and unyielding meaning but are constructed in historical contexts and institutional settings. We must take into account the social contexts in which the words are used; entertaining a skepticism about practices that offer to make the world better.

3. The third theme pursues a central issue about the purpose of evaluation. It argues that evaluation has a policy clarification purpose. It can help to illuminate the tensions, contradictions, and ambiguities that underlie the realization of educational reform; it does not tell us what policy is most efficient or useful. This may seem obvious. Reforms respond to perceived issues and problems that, at face value, are not clearly defined and do not have linear outcomes. Of the deepest value to the public debates around which schooling in a democracy (and of importance not only to policy makers) is an understanding of the strains and tensions found in the relations in school arenas. Evaluation, at its most productive sense, considers the tensions, struggles, and ambiguities as social practices relate to social goals. Further, the reform priorities of teacher education are indelibly tied to social, cultural, and economic conditions; these cannot be lost in the methodologies of evaluation.

Recent studies of teacher education and teaching will provide illustrations of the relation of reform, knowledge, and power.

## I. Social Production and Social Reception of Policy

At least two related issues are central in evaluation. One is the relation of evaluation to state planning. Second, is the realization of reform in social fields that "carry" values and interests that are not necessarily those of the program planners. As a result, the strategies and procedures of reforms maintain social values that should be scrutinized.

### *State Policy, Policing, and Evaluation*

Evaluation is a part of state regulation, monitoring and steering. In this sense, policy and policing are epistemologically related; policing, in its French and German origin, refers to the specific techniques by which government, in the framework of the state, enabled individuals to be useful to society (Foucault, 1988, p. 154). Older forms of evaluation involved political arithmetic or statistics in which the state collected demographic and other data to steer reform policies during the formation of the modern state (see, e.g., Haskell, 1984). More recently, evaluation is intended to provide public accountability for different and sometimes contradictory reform strategies (such as to introduce standards that make a citizenry that is more productive in an arena of increased international competitiveness while, at the same time, to provide a humanism that allows for cultural and social diversity).

On the surface, the current situation of evaluation has a particular historical character. Evaluation is considered necessary for decision making and accountability. But to understand this situation, we need to think relationally about the state, local community, and schooling. In part, evaluation emerges as a professional field to respond to increased governmental involvement in the educational sector following World War II.[3] Further, the particular form that evaluation took in the United States involved particular social constellations. There is a long standing commitment to local governance, individual school improvement, and university autonomy in professional education. This commitment to the local and the "individual" occurs, as Weiler (1990) argues, as part of state formations in which accountability and steering are of great importance. It is related to the need for competentory **legitimation**. United States evaluation strategies should also be seen as maintaining historically derived commitments to define change through individual practices (Meyer, 1987; Popkewitz, 1991).

While we often value the individual and local governance over state rule (e.g., school site management), we cannot disregard the societal purposes that are part of the normative construction of state

agendas. We need to understand how social goals, articulated through state policies, become reconstituted as they are realized in the institutional practices (Lundgren, 1990). Thus, evaluation has a policing quality in the modern state, whether we see it as part of the noble intent and desire of those who seek to improve school or as part of the darker side of social regulation.

My reason for starting with this assertion is neither to demean the effort of state actions nor to pose an anarchist view of the social processes of schooling. Rather, my intention is to remind the reader that evaluation is not merely a strategy that "objectively" describes outcomes of educational practices. This becomes more crucial in the United States where there is historical anesthesia toward school as a state institution; social/political values are hidden in research paradigms of teacher education that emphasize change as individual, teaching as a problem of psychological motivation, and as sociology that is centered on organizational efficiency rather than social relations of schooling (see Popkewitz, 1984, 1991). The problem of evaluation must be positioned within educational fields that include studies of the power relations which, at root, contribute to the processes of social production, regulation, and the creation of human capabilities. (See Bourdieu, 1989 for a discussion of the problems in the social field of intellectuals.)

### *Reform in Social Fields*

With the state as a central actor, the problem of evaluation is constructed within particular social fields and power relations. The questions, conceptual schemes and "tools" of teacher education contain assumptions, debates, and implications to how questions are framed and solutions legitimated.

The public discussions in the United States give attention to the changing international character of economic relations, the redesigning of national priorities in schooling and the need to maintain greater cultural strength through the socialization processes of schooling. This new nationalism stresses the country's international competitiveness while focusing on local flexibility and semi-autonomy -- with national standards by which to judge local attainment. In contrast to the 1960s school reform efforts in the United States, which made curriculum issues focal, the current reforms give attention to teacher quality, standards of work and professional education. Market metaphors (i.e., choice) are combined with those of outputs (accountability) in the current reforms, looking at output measures such as SAT scores to determine progress.

Teacher education has been a centerpiece of these reforms. Research has focused on the qualities of a good teacher and sought to

emphasize those qualities in programs. Greater emphasis is sought on relating pedagogical questions of teaching to the cognitive disciplines in which teachers work. Research on teaching of mathematics, technology, and science is sponsored by the U.S. government and foundations. Priority is given to relating psychological paradigms for translating disciplinary knowledge into school subjects; often with professionalism in other disciplines fighting for the legitimacy of their subjects through obtaining research and development funds. Model programs are tried; professional schools established for training teachers, and greater attention is given to whom comes into teacher education programs (see, e.g., Holmes Group, 1986, 1990). Criteria for certification and credentialing have become revised by state governments to reflect economic goals of teaching mathematics and technology and social goals related to making schools responsive to the diverse populations in the United States. There is continual reference to the amount of time teachers spend doing administrative work and routinized activities, such as collecting and grading papers or responding to central office requests. The language of reform seeks to produce a more professional teacher corps that has increased status, responsibility, and financial reward.

We can evaluate the reforms at different layers of understanding and interpretation. One is a tendency to consider the behavioral and organizational conditions of reform: Are teacher education programs revising course syllabi? Are programs giving students adequate time in practical experiences? Are students having opportunities to work with diverse populations? The notion of a National Report Card issued by the Department of Education follows this line of thinking. At a different level of evaluation, there is a focus on the conditions in which student teachers work: Do student teachers, for example, have time to share ideas and to attend professional conferences? Notions of standards, collegiality, professionalization, and community appear to frame these questions and the successes of reform. There is greater reference given teachers, as they are to be more autonomous and responsible in their work place.

The approaches follow what is often done in school evaluation and is a standard of the larger paradigm of educational research from which it is drawn.[4] The properties of evaluation are viewed as having conceptually distinct and ordered qualities that could be controlled and manipulated toward some desired end, with utility of practice given greatest value. Evaluations assume that organizational activities can be modified by more efficient management, and the results of a planned change defined and measured against cost (monetary and social). A result tends to be random collection of data about surface (observable and measurable) qualities of teaching and teacher education.

In this paper, I want to argue for an approach to evaluation that focuses on the social patterns and conceptions of knowledge that order these patterns and conceptions. Our concern is how reform practices organize and give value to certain types of social relations and, at the same time, structure out of consideration other possibilities for education. This layer of analysis enables us to consider the organizational and perceptual characteristics related to a reform but provide conceptual ways of understanding the assumptions, implications, and consequences of social practices.[5] Examples from an elementary school and teacher education evaluations provide an illustration of the social complexities with which evaluators must grapple. Then I will proceed to reconsider the theoretical issues that underlie these evaluations.

## *The Social Complexities of An Alternative Certification Program: An Example*

One of the major changes in teacher education has been the introduction of alterative certification programs. These programs provide ways in which college graduates in non-education majors can teach in critical areas without going through a regular teacher education program. The particular one that we examined was national in scope and sought to bring into rural and urban schools students who graduated from liberal arts colleges but who wished to make a commitment to teaching for at least two years.[6] About 500 recent graduates volunteered and attended an eight-week summer session to prepare them for teaching that fall. Once in their teaching sites, they would work as regular teachers while obtaining certification. The alternative certification program fills an important niche in teacher education: directly recruiting and training teachers in areas where there is a severe shortage. In addition, the corps of teachers are people who are well-educated in their particular field.

As part of the evaluation of this program, we sought to understand what was being taught to the first-year teachers as they entered schools and how these efforts relate to existing social relations that define urban and rural schools. The evaluation, then, was to consider how the "components" of the reform program was realized in its social contexts: exploring the ways in which discursive patterns and the institutional practices that structured the linguistic and classroom practices of the new teacher changes. We did a survey of mentor teachers and administrators (and found that they liked the performance of the first-year teachers); but also sought to measure the ways in which teachers, administrators, and first year teachers structured the problems and tasks of teaching and the conceptions that they held of knowledge, teaching, children, and community. With these statistical data were systematic observations and interviews in each of the five regions in which the new teachers were

placed. The field data were collected throughout the summer institute and school year. Some tentative summaries of these relations can be identified here:

- There was a shift in the perceptions of the first-year teachers from an idealism that saw a teacher as a missionary to one who had to learn classroom management and control for success. Goals were revised. Teaching was viewed as part teaching textbook content and part motivator of children who the teachers saw as having little self-esteem.[7]

- The textbook and testing became the center of curriculum. This responded to a variety of "control" factors. It was to control content when absenteeism and movement among families provided very little physical continuity in classrooms. It was a control mechanism in school districts where there was little money for supplies and books. Social control was also a characteristic. The strong regimentation associated with textbook teaching and continual testing was to instill discipline. This was through the information conveyed and through the rituals of social interactions applied. While clearly it did not work, the ritual of practice created a sense of order to the curriculum and social patterns in classrooms.[8]

- The first year teachers developed an "educational" language that shifted attention away from the social conditions that impacted on their teaching and legitimated ongoing practices of the school. This language was not technical but based on rules and standards of reasoning that is associated with schooling. Problems were made into those of the psychology of the individual or the pathology of the community. The novice teachers talked about setting educational objectives as central to their professional role or about the need to develop self-esteem among the students before they could learn properly.

- The language of management and psychology were used to evaluate the competence of teachers themselves. A rural principal talked about the first year teacher having a difficult time because of the poor motivation of the children and the lack of management skills. There was a tie of competence to control which is then related to whom the children were -- from poor families and of color.

- These languages about the problems and solution of educational problems recast practices so as to make the problem of reform as one of learning some "proper" content, individual initiative and psychological characteristics rather than of structural concerns. The language coded the racial and economic distinctions within the district. In rural areas, schools were internally segregated by

race, with people of color tracked in the lower class. In urban settings, segregation was the order of the day.

- There was an emphasis on practice as learning about teaching. There was talk about "the real difference between "theory" and "practice." This set up a dualism in which what teachers did in schools was given value. This, in turn, gave value to existing social patterns of school practices; thus legitimated, as an unintended consequence, social inequities carried in the day-to-day instruction.

- The alternative certification program intersected with other school reforms in a manner that decontextualizes and reformulates social issues into administrative ones. Mentoring systems, an important reform to help first year teachers, tended to focus on advice about how to work in a bureaucracy, such as getting the duplication needed or what networks exist within the school to get supplies, or how to plan with objectives. The discourse structured out consideration of what was selected to teach, and the social/cultural contexts in which teaching was realized.

- State definitions for social amelioration were reformulated through the social processes in schooling. State definitions of children in need of special help define those who come to school as special "populations" in need of remediation. While not policymakers' intent, labels, such as a "Chapter One School" were used to consider the pathological character of the school's students.

- The official categories created a history for the schools; the official categories defined the enterprises from distinctions drawn from policies about social amelioration and regulation. The official language about reform co-existed with teacher discourses about the management of classrooms and psychologies of children's competence that gave focus to individuality as a "core" assumption to define teachers, school, and student competence or failure. The reform discourses and the teacher "knowledge" were mutually sustaining in these assumptions about the world of schooling. The professional classification filtered out consideration of the social complexities of the situations of schooling, in some cases redefining the rich histories of schools as a community institution. In their place were references to the particularities of individuals as part of statistic/aggregates that defined them as economically, culturally, and socially poor. The family/community were symbolically represented as populations which have no history or sociality except as part of the aggregate used to group them as in "need." The use of phrases such as "schools in transition" also provided a language that reconceptualizes and reformulates who the children are and the tasks of the school.

In each state, the national teacher recruitment program had to respond to state governmental requirements for certification. Alternative certification programs administered by states reinforced this valuing of the immediate and useful in teaching. Certification courses focused on methods of mainstreaming, for example, without dealing with the social and political debates that underlie the pedagogical approaches. In some states, first-year teachers had to spend 150 hours writing their lesson objectives and reports of meetings held with their mentors as part of the certification requirement. Reflection, another slogan of teacher education reforms, was sociologically restricted to writing objectives about upcoming lessons.

The study of the alternative program provides a way to consider how an innovative program is located into institutional patterns and discourses about education. An alchemy occurred as the public rhetoric about reform passed into the social space of schooling. Institutionalized practices and professional discourses shaped and framed boundaries by which reform give reference to economic issues and cultural debates. The social density and the mobilization of discourse constitute and express an ordering of the world that teachers inhabited. We can think of the categorical and syntactical procedures in schools as establishing hierarchies, relations, and values. I will return to this issue in the following sections, after I provide a second example.

### *School Reform, Classroom Cultures, and Social Differentiation: An Example*

In this section, I want to explore how pedagogical practices themselves carry power relations that have cultural, social, and political implications. In a study of an elementary school reform (Popkewitz, et al, 1982), for example, we explored how six schools in different parts of the country used a particular program called Individually Guided Instruction. As before, the focus was on the classroom dynamics and social relations in which the program was realized.

The initial expectation was to consider variations of implementation of the reform as all schools incorporated the same organization patterns, used the same curriculum, and had the same technical languages and numonics for talking about expectations and experiences -- IGE, ICC, multi-unit schools, differentiated staffing, and so on.[9] But rather than a common school, the schools we visited were different in their cultural organization of teaching and learning. These differences related to a number of different social phenomena -- education and occupation of parents, income, gender, race, and religion were intertwined in the productions of accomplishment and competence defined in schools. Thus, while students in different schools might use similar textbooks or participate in similar lessons about

map reading, the cultural messages were different in the schools that we studied. How the maps or books were treated as a "learning" experience, the role of the student and teacher in deciphering the maps and books, and the authority to base the knowledge about people and places were very different. These social distinctions and differentiations in schooling need to be considered as part of the accounting of schooling itself.

We called these different social conditions of schools Constructive, Technical, and Illusory schooling. What is important here is that the conversations in the daily instruction were differences in the expectations and demands of teachers and students. Some stressed gaining information, others placed value on autonomy, responsibility, and the tentativeness of knowledge itself. A third went through all the motions of teaching and learning, but there was no carry through. The teaching had to do with trying to morally uplift the students through references to the students' background and the importing of other values. At a different level, the classroom discussions "told" students about how they should act, talk, speak, and think about themselves and the world in which they live. Implicit in the instruction was political theories about citizen involvement (passive or active) and the representation of what is good/bad or possible and not possible.

The different cultural messages carried in the schools had little to do with traditional notions of teacher competency; such as years teaching, classroom climate, levels of education, or classroom management techniques. The differences involved a complex relation between social/economic and cultural conditions in the community, that included, in some instances, religious beliefs and institutions, and professional discursive practices within the school. The constructive school was located in a professional community in which students brought to school certain expectations and teachers maintained perceptions about what is legitimate for students to do. In the Illusory schools, expectations and demands were built on the welfare situation, family life, and work horizons posited in the community.

Rather than a common school, there were different types of schooling for different children that had little to do with the formal criteria of achievement or competence in the relation of teaching and learning. These expectations and demands were established through the interactional patterns and cognitive structures that organized everyday life of teachers and students. In turn, these relations were reformulated into a school language of efficiency and psychology of the individual.

In both evaluations, the inquiry about performance, competence and "outcomes" went beyond the formal goals and policies of the projects to consider the power relations that were embodied in its so-

cial patterns. In both instances, the evaluations were conceptually driven to relate knowledge and institutional patterns to power. I would like to explore further this notion of power in the next section by considering discourses of research and evaluation about teaching and teacher education. Here, I will argue that evaluation needs to consider the categories and rules of speech about schooling and teacher education as forms of social regulation.

## II. Styles of Reasoning and Constructing the Subject: Discourse and Power

In this section, I focus on a particular concept of power that was implicit in the previous discussion; one that explores the standards of reasoning, ways of thinking and rules of truth that underlie teacher education and school reform. The current reform efforts have a mode of presentation and styles of reasoning that are not only "telling" stories about schooling, teachers, and teacher education but also constructing the subject itself; establishing value and authority about the ways in which we define what is good, legitimate, and plausible about schooling and teaching. We can think of a constant litany of words in current educational reform; among them, professionalism, teachers' thought, content knowledge, codifiable knowledge and knowledge base, empowerment, reflection, teacher efficiency and practice. The words are not free floating words that have unfixed and unyielding meanings over time, but assume a particular nexus of relations, hierarchy, and value as teacher education relates with schooling. The distinctions, categories, and difference establish a cognitive structure about "Others" (students, parents, and community) and of "self"; the teacher and teaching.

My use of cognitive structures, however, has little to do with the current interest in cognitive psychology which defines the mind as independent of social and historical circumstances. My discussion of "structures" is drawn from the sociology of knowledge. In particular, I am concerned with how reforms embody a particular form of consciousness about schooling, teaching, and teacher education. As do Berger, Berger and Kellner (1973), I consider the resulting styles of thought and perception associated with teacher education as a particular type of consciousness about the world that is tied to particular institutions and institutional processes.

Evaluation methodologies need to consider language as an instrument of action and power. Under the guise of methodological distinctions, evaluation strategies establish particular sets of linguistic practices as dominant and legitimate. This language formation, however, occurs in specific social and political conditions. Presupposed are certain forms of cognition and belief about competence and

performance. Agreeing with Bourdieu (1991), we can think of language as a form of symbolic power or violence; in which interests of particular groups are established through symbolic exchanges rather than imposing dominance through brute force. The symbolic violence occurs as the communicative exchanges are made to seem to rest on a foundation of shared belief, but the hierarchies of distinctions and differentiations fix values in a manner "that even those who benefit least from the exercise of power participate, to some extent, in their own subjections" (p. 23). The nature of symbolic power, Bourdieu continues, is that it presupposes an active complicity as the distinctions that legitimate, in our case, the calls for reform become the belief about salvation for those who seek to redress their oppressions.

Concepts and categories have two sides (Smith, 1990). There is the surface in which the concept and category abstract form, and express social relations. There is also an underside of social relations in which the concept or category arises. Reform concepts such as "individualization," "empowerment," "community," and "participation," -- part of the common sense in teacher educational reforms -- have meaning to the extent that the distinctions that they make are already apparent in the structure of their actual social relations. People grasp them as particular forms of ordering their practical activities. It is this underside of language in history that I believe is an important element to the ways evaluation is conceptualized.

### *The Language of Reform as a Structuring of Social Relations*

Examining the structuring principles of a language about reform can be pursued through the "use" of the words, professionalization and professionalism. The current teacher education reform movement, for example, makes professionalization and school improvement as goals of policy in the current educational reforms. These words appear in various ways in the reforms of the United States, Iceland, Australia, Sweden, Spain, among other nations. The words, however, do not have an absolute character that refers to basic ideas or conditions of schooling. Words do not represent reality, they are part of its creation, sustenance, and renewal. Words refer to concepts that change in relation to their position with other words and in relation to the social conditions in which they are used. To examine its use is to understand how power can operate through the effects of discourse.

It is apparent as we examine the historical literature that there is no understanding of profession in any universal manner. There are important differences between the Anglo-American and European continental traditions of professions. In part, these differences have to do with the different forms of state developments in relation

to certain middle class and elite occupations. In France, for example, professions were sponsored by state agendas and tied to the development of state agendas through Napoleonic reforms. British and American professional development occurred through changes in civil society but quickly established relations with the state, including sponsorship of the nascent social sciences. In many European countries, such as Germany and Spain, there was no word similar to that of the Anglo-Saxon word "profession." In Germany, the "bildungburger" refers to an educated class and the word "professional" has only been incorporated in relation of academic discourses (Kocka, 1990). In recent years, however, the Anglo-Saxon word "profession" has been brought into the language of many continental countries to describe the social formations of work within the middle class and increase importance of expertise in the process of production/reproduction.

To incorporate the Anglo-American conception of profession imposes an implicit interpretive "lens" about knowledge, occupations, and state. At a social level, there is an assumption of an occupation controlling a market of liberal theory about society as based on individual social contracts, and entrepreneurial relations are given privilege (Collins, 1990). At an epistemological level, the individualism is based on a particular managerial conception of knowledge; social phenomena and individual "development" can be rationally and hierarchical order to provide for social betterment. These assumptions (social and epistemological) are found in much of the discussion about American professions in which ideal types of disinterested occupations are offered that are separate from the state. Autonomy, technical knowledge, occupational control of entry, remuneration, and high ethics dominate this recounting.

The ideal types, however, have little basis in fact; they ignore the political struggles, debates and compromises involved in the formation of the professions. Nor do these types account for the ways in which modern professions become a part of the social regulation and governance structures of the modern state (see Burrage & Torstendahl, 1990). The major purpose of these ideal types is as legitimating strategies for maintaining cultural and social authority, not for analytical purposes.

The "ideal type" of profession has assumed importance in the United States as an issue of school improvement. As an ideological stance, it seems difficult to argue against; teachers should participate in their work with autonomy, integrity, and responsibility. At this level, the slogan is important to a reconstruction of schooling. But to talk about professionalism, integrity, and responsibility without focusing on the content of the participation and the structural relations that shape it, is to lose site of the historicity of our practices.

"Professionalism" has been an aspect of reform in U.S. education since the early 19th century; it referred to two different layers in the formation of the occupation. Professionalism was a slogan for those "at the top," including administrators and university professors. This occurred with the specialization in university training and the development of new disciplines of educational sciences (as part of the planning and evaluation of schooling) (Powell, 1980). This strata of the occupation tended to be male-dominated and better paid than teachers (typically women); administrators and professors enjoyed degrees of responsibility in the conceptualization and organization of their work conditions. The organization of higher education and research in education provided routes for the occupational mobility of men. Further, much of the research and evaluation schemes for schooling relegated teachers to an ancillary status and focused on assessment of large groups of students and indicators of qualities of the entire school system. The administration also contained elements of social regulation for those at the bottom of the occupational ladder -- usually in the name of school improvement or effectiveness.

At the bottom were teachers. Many of the reforms of the late nineteenth century made teaching more bureaucratic in the name of professionalization (see, e.g., Mattingly, 1987). Standardized hiring practices, uniform curriculum policies, and teacher evaluation practices eroded spheres of teacher autonomy and responsibility through an increased rationalization of school organization and didactics. At no time in the history of modern mass schooling have the working conditions of teachers in the United States provided the opportunity to reflect about their situation in a sustained manner. Teacher education has been pragmatic and fragmented; it devalues an intellectual focus.

In fact, the words of profession have taken on meanings which tie the regulatory values found in U.S. schools to the concept of bureaucracy that the new reforms were instituted to change. Their assumptions about and categorizations of social phenomena contain a classical Weberian formulation of bureaucracy. Social reality becomes one-dimensional to include particular categories of people without considering the substantive quality of the resulting interactions. Its products are seen in relation to utilitarian values. Community consensus and participation are based on administrative criteria that define people as interest groups with homogeneous values; the conflict and debate about purposes that cross the lines of the designated actors are structured out of consideration. Internally, school processes are seen as orderly; elements can be placed into proper and, thereby, manageable places. Each component has a self-contained unit with a specific relationship to other elements. Action is seen in relation to an abstract frame of reference that is divorced from the specified, complex tasks of teaching. Denied is a sense of the history and the power relations involved in the formation of schooling (for a different conception in teacher education, see Tom 1990).

These trends continue in current reform efforts, linking professionalism to school improvement. A study of three school districts (Popkewitz & Lind, 1989) involved in an effort to increase teachers' professionalism indicates this very clearly. The reform strategies increased the teachers' work load and the level of monitoring of teacher practices. Evaluation was to provide "evidence" of teacher accountability and more rational approaches toward school improvement. It was assumed that there is a direct relation between the knowledge of evaluation and specific practices and actions. Teacher evaluations valued instrumental and procedural concerns and devalued the craft and expressive elements of teaching -- those elements that have gender implications.

In one of the sessions in which teachers were considering evaluation approaches, they brought in an outside expert who owned a commercial company selling evaluations. He argued that the evaluations were created because teachers did not want to do them, "they wear their heart on their sleeves," he said. The proposed evaluations would make the tasks of improving teaching scientific and objective. Teachers would go into another's classroom to observe and record by checking off words that described the classroom: well-managed, enthusiastic, directive, scholarly. On examining the words, it was clear that the categories described tightly controlled classrooms and said nothing about what was taught. Further, behaviors such as "expressive" were devalued through the rating system applied. This subtle emphasis and deemphasis can be related to issues of gender itself.

This brings us to two issues which can be summarized briefly. One is the complexity of reform. To solely consider the organizational and behavioral elements of reform is to obscure the manner in which knowledge about reform, teacher thinking, and school practices interrelate as an effect of power. Further, the discussion of teacher improvement in the United States carries certain historical assumptions about social relations and progress. Two, and which I will explore further in the next section, the categories of research and evaluation do interrelate to provide boundaries that structure out certain possibilities and legitimate others through the discourse that is constructed about school change.

### *The Ordering of Populations and Issues of Regulation*

Part of the cognitive structures that represent **and** produce a "common sense" about teacher education is the defining of people as "populations." The concepts and procedures of social science and bureaucracy inscribe people as having discrete attributes by eliciting information and data or by establishing categories and codes for observation and recoding (Smith, 1990). The concepts make it seem

that what is out there is what actually happens. For example, the demographers' use of sex as a category counts sexiness not as a matter of speculation but involves gender presuppositions about the actual everyday practices that are generated as a feature of the social organization in which the demographer works.

Let me take as an example from transcripts from recent interviews of first-year teachers' working in the Los Angeles area. Many of the teachers came from private, elite universities and saw the teaching experience as "giving back" to society for the privilege that they has had. Much of the curriculum, however, was designed around textbooks and testing.

One new teacher discussed the pressure for tests and school standards as related to the social background of the children who came to school. The teacher of Spanish thought that the school places requirements on children that they do not need, such as learning Spanish.

> Students need English. To students that need to be able to write simple sentences in English. To students that need to be able to carry on a conversation without saying "ain't." Or "got none" or any of that, that there are a lot of requirements being put on the students by the school that the teachers don't even have anything to do with, that we have to teach that these students really, they need to know it, but not as much as they need to know other stuff. Not every one of my students needs to know Spanish, but every one of my students needs better English skills. Desperately.

The teacher places this pressure on certain requirements and the students "needs" in relation to the African-American homes and community. She said:

> I didn't realize the background my kids came from. I didn't realize, I didn't realize that my background was where I had a safe place where I could go home and study as much as I wanted whereas these kids, they're lucky if they can sleep at home, let alone do anything else. Even watch TV. All they do when they're home is have their parents yell at them and have their parents blow smoke in their face from their cigarettes and things like that. They can't study. And the school is just so disruptive, like is going on now, there's so much pressure not to learn, there's so much pressure not to do what's expected of you that the best that most of these kids can hope for is to get through here without being permanently scarred.

Populational characteristics inscribed on these students are: crime figures, teenage pregnancy, single and extended family homes, and so on are made into representations of the "Other" who are in need remediation; the "At-Risk" children of the school. The language of populations objectifies the immediate and social relations of these students and constitutes and expresses them as separate and distinct from the subjectivities and "real world" of social relations in which they live. The social organization of reading the factual accounts "inserts" categorical and syntactic procedures into the actuality of education; thus establishing a normalcy to schooling based on pathological distinctions.

In teacher education, processes of learning how to teach inscribe the "population" distinctions into the attributes of students and teaching. The ongoing practices of different professionals in particular sites and across sites are coordinated and standardized through languages of "at risk," "learning disabilities," and the label of "Chapter One" schools. In these objectivifications of schooling, teachers learn how to relate to members of their own professions and to those of others, and they learn how to talk **to** students and how to talk to students so as to be able to talk about students that responds to structural and power relations. The psychological categories of affective and cognitive attributes and definitions of achievement also posit not only ways to talk about schooling, but linguistically conelates to strategies of lesson planning and teacher reflectiveness.

The constructing teacher education as an object of scrutiny also entails power relations. My concern with power is with its *effects* as it circulates through institutional practices and the discourses of daily life. Here, the work of Michel Foucault is most helpful in understanding how structures of thought are practices that construct the objects of the world rather than represent those objects. This concept of power, Foucault argues, is embedded in the governing systems of order, appropriation, and exclusion by which subjectivities are constructed and social life is formed. This occurs at multiple layers of daily life, from the organization of institutions to the self-discipline and regularization of the perceptions and experiences according to which individuals act. Power is embodied in the ways that individuals construct boundaries for themselves, define categories of good/bad, and envision possibilities. The effects of power are in the production of desire, dispositions, and sensitivities. Power, in this latter sense, is intricately bound to the rules, standards, and styles of reasoning by which individuals speak, think, and act in producing their everyday world (see Foucault, 1988; also Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, Noujain, 1987; Rajchman, 1985).[10]

Here I am countering the folk-wisdom of research on teaching which says that teachers do not have a technical language and therefore are not professional. When discourse is examined rather than

the use of words, teachers express a language in which certain categories, distinctions, and differentiations are made that relate to institutional practices. Teachers seem to have certain standards and rules of speech that establish an occupational "identity"; and that language distinctions between what is to be spoken about as schooling and what is not considered as legitimate speech.

## III. Tensions in the Relation of State and Teacher Education: A Problematic for Evaluation[11]

The two previous themes focused on the historical limitations and contradictions of evaluation; I would now like to focus on a different element in the problematic of evaluation: the promise of evaluation is not in foretelling what is to be done, but in understanding the tensions, dilemmas, and ambiguities that underlie the current transformations. Reform is not an object that can be installed or that has essential properties to be discovered. The processes of reform are dynamic not static or linear; therefore, evaluation requires a scrutiny of the relations that occur in its setting. Further, it will be argued that evaluation is inevitably about the past rather than the present or future. Its contribution to policy making is through an illumination of the dilemmas, tensions, and contradictions of how things have worked.

Evaluation is not a problem of school improvement as it is traditionally assumed. Nor is it a problem of "testing" or "verifying" state practices as though there is a consensus of values or a standard notion of progress. The problems of schooling are of a different order, one which evaluations can help to illuminate, but will not solve. At best, evaluations can provide a greater understanding of the tensions, struggles, and dilemmas that underlie efforts toward social improvement; the very moral, political, and cultural complexity of schooling as a social endeavor makes the search for precision and certainty as a chimera.

Let me conclude this section by saying that I do not believe evaluation can provide a direct plan of the present or of the future. Evaluation is inevitably about the past. Epistemologically, evaluation and social science are dialects of language and involve interpretations of what has happened. While we like to think of our generalizations as present-centered, we are constrained by the constructions of narratives that occur after the events. The language that is used in schooling that built on the outcomes of past struggles. There is also a political question here. When we adopt a belief that knowledge is about prediction and administration, we allow science and its relation to the empirical world to move into the realm of ideology and social control. The rituals of science and evaluation become a rhe-

torical form whose purpose is to convince others that what is being done to them is in their best interest.

I say this because I can find no evidence that social science and school evaluation have anything to say, **qua** science, about the future. They do offer methods for understanding the boundaries that exist in the past and the dilemmas that are embedded in those arrangements. This is not to say that science cannot help us in the choices we make, but it is often in a negative voice. To borrow partially from Karl Popper, science (and evaluation) do not verify but refute. They can help us understand what choices to make, such as in eliminating fluorins, controlling the deforestation in the Amazon, or limiting the use of intelligence testing. But -- in the policy arena -- the findings of science are part of a public debate that rarely concerns evidence alone. The determination of futures is no longer reserved for particular elites and experts who claim a sacred knowledge.

Before ending this discussion about past, futures, and evaluation, there is an important caveat. Evaluation is about the future in an indirect way. The categories of evaluation organize phenomena in a manner that sensitizes us toward certain possibilities and, at the same time, filters out others. Implicit in practices, then, are ways in which people are to challenge the world and locate themselves in its ongoing relations. This is what Steiner Kvale (1990) has made clear in his discussion of evaluation as a knowledge and constituting practice which produces a censorship of meaning. To focus on the problem of tension and ambiguities is not to remove the necessity of collecting demographic or achievement data, but to make the collection of data responsive to the central issues posed in the evaluation. The role of evaluation and evaluators in the ongoing construction of the world is one of continual scrutiny.

## IV. The Enlightenment Project as a Problematic for Evaluation

What I would like to propose here is a reconsideration of an old Western European commitment to the Enlightenment, although recasting it, as a major purpose of evaluation. By the word "Enlightenment" I mean a view in which people are assumed to have competence and responsibility for the governance of their own lives. Schools, in this context, are an important educative institution in the realization of that goal. The major strands of twentieth century European and U.S. philosophy, sociology of knowledge, cultural studies, and literary analysis refocus the problem of the Enlightenment on the boundaries to our existence, the ambiguity of knowledge, and the

fundamental relationship of social practices, power, and knowledge. The redefining of Enlightenment project becomes bound with a recognition that there are multiple truth claims, that these truth claims are historically bound and emerge from the social struggles and tensions of a world in which we live, and that the production of human possibilities always contains contradiction. The question of evaluation is how schools of education and professional programs reflect and sustain these commitments.

Posing of a curriculum entails certain general and seemingly transcendent values that we wish to maintain in schooling. In European traditions, these values relate notions of democracy to reason. Curriculum supposes philosophical assumptions that reason and rationality can help improve social conditions; political assumptions about the relation and responsibilities of people and institutions; and cultural assumptions about the central values and patterns that should give direction to social affairs. Yet contemporary scholarship makes us aware that however noble our hopes, a curriculum is a socially constructed and politically bound practice. At all times, our language and social practices in schools are precarious and limited, containing contradictions. As we engage in the tasks of constructing and realizing a curriculum, what are defined as possibilities are also prisons.

**The problem of evaluation, then, is not merely that of school improvement or decision making, but of the conditions under which and the manner in which the knowledge of schooling is produced in teacher education.** Evaluation needs to focus not only on fundamental assumptions about the purposes of schooling that underlie practice, but, as significantly, on issues about the relation of individuals to society which exist in the constructions of pedagogy. Evaluation should promote a discourse about education which examines the ways schools illuminate or obscure the social conditions in which people live. While I recognize the difficulty of conceptualizing such assessments, I believe that attention should be continually directed to what is most important through carefully considering the conceptualization by which data are defined and collected.

The complex and profound problem of curriculum can be expressed as a conflict between the hope we place in schooling and what happens as people seek to create, sustain, and renew the conditions of their world (see Lundgren, 1983). The history of curriculum is one in which theories are never realized in the manner they are intended. As theories are put into social practice, there are always unintended, unanticipated, and unwilled consequences as theories are put into social practice.

Here, I am taking up the theme of the social construction of knowledge that is so prominent in social theory and philosophy (e.g., Rorty, 1989; Giddens, 1987). My interest is to consider a socially constructed knowledge as a strategy for the construction and evaluation of school curriculum. This "turn" to constructivism, however, is not a psychological one that focuses on how students mediate a given knowledge. It is sociological, historical, and linguistically based. Science, mathematics, literature, and art are to be considered as social fields which they are -- multiple and competing ways of thinking and acting toward the world. These paradigmatic endeavors are struggles for authority about what is legitimate truth.

Evaluation needs to consider whether the selection of school knowledge pays attention to the variety, debates, and tensions that exist in how people come to know and interpret their world. It is also to consider the relations of power/knowledge in those formulations of teaching and learning.

The problem of school learning and evaluation is to consider how students come to grips with the human constructions of knowledge--its fragility, tentativeness, skepticism and change. It is not to correct misrepresentations as the psychologists of education would have us believe; but to consider the variety of representations that exist and how systems of thought are practices that shape and fashion social, cultural, and political worlds. It is to recognize various dialects in schooling as tribal and partial. Whether reforms focus on teaching science or on the heritages of various peoples who live within the United States, the evaluation of practice should direct attention to the types of reasoning developed, and the means by which both a trust and a healthly skepticism toward the world can be accomplished.

We can also think of the everyday world of schooling as having differentiations that are produced through the social patterns of school life. The patterns of conversation and the practices of teaching are not common to all; they contain multiple layers of meaning and interpretation. In back of the rituals of a common institution are social differentiations: not all children are taught the same things nor are the dispositions, sensitivities, and awareness common across social groupings. In light of this, we need to ask: What knowledge is to be transmitted to whom? What are the different cultural and social messages transmitted in classroom interactions?

How these problems are represented within our teacher education programs needs to be the problem of evaluation. Methodologies need to be constructed that give attention to how teacher education interrelates with schooling. This task cannot be defined technically, such as whether one uses qualitative or quantitative (nomothetical/ideographically) procedures to collect information. It is an intellec-

tual task of creating concepts and ways of collecting and interpreting data in order to consider the complexities of the situations that we confront in teaching and teacher education; it involves theoretically attention to structural relations in which schooling exists; while at the same time giving reference to the historical specificity of our human conditions (see, e.g., Mills, 1959; Wallenstein, 1991). Further, the concepts of evaluation need to provide ways of considering the complexities of knowledge

While I have not exhausted any possible set of questions for considering issues of the Enlightenment in schooling, I recognize that the paradoxes of knowledge and power relations also produce paradoxes for evaluation. The imposition of a curriculum assumes a transcendence of certain knowledge that has a potential for achieving a better society; yet to propose a single form of knowledge is to structure out other possibilities. This process is never neutral and never without social implications. Knowledge is always located in a social and material world. The contradictions of teaching and teacher education are those of our occupational roles. In focusing on the issues of Enlightenment as frames for evaluation, we return to the problem of irony, contradiction, and dilemma that evaluations can illuminate.

## V. Conclusion

In fundamental ways, teacher education is bound to tensions of violation, production, and reproduction in society. Schooling is a social creation to deal with the ruptures of cultural production and reproduction (see Lundgren, 1989). For many in our contemporary landscape, schooling is part of the modern quest to eliminate inequality and injustice; at the same time, there are the larger tensions of the structure of inequality that occurs in the cultural debates of school. While certain groups in the United States call for cultural pluralism as a way to give focus to the integrity of disenfranchised groups, others are calling for a new nation-building effort for U.S. schools. For the former, pedagogy is to make distinctions and difference as a valued category of society. The latter fears the increasing minority population in schools and suggests that schools strive to help create a national consensus and social solidarity. For these people, recognizing cultural differences is a tactic for arriving at more varied (and in the aggregate more effective) methods of putting across the traditional curriculum. With scores on standardized tests as the measure of success, schooling retains the particular cultural discourse that is embedded in the standardized testing industry. Teacher education, in this context, carries the tensions, violations, and productive elements of schooling itself.

We like to pretend that the world can be made rational, that progress is an obtainable goal, and that policy is the instrument of

the modern version of salvation. I do not deny that we must keep on trying, but I also recognize that we know little about social and educational change. A focus on ambiguity and uncertainty is my way to explore what Lundgren has called the tension between our hopes and happenings.

I have located some questions about the social transformations, systems of ordering, and constructions of teacher education as a central problematic of evaluation. I recognize that these problems are not easily measured or conceptualized. It is almost as if our role is like that of Sisyphus -- never fully succeeding, but struggling to give attention to what is most important.

### *Notes*

1. This paper was prepared for the Second National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students' Issues, sponsored by the U.S. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs and the Center on Assessment, Evaluation, and Testing at the University of California and the Center for Research on cultural Diversity and Second language learning, at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Washington, D.C.; Grand Hyatt Hotel, September 4-6, 1991.

2. This is contrary to the argument of Berger and Luckman (1967) who separate primary and secondary institutions of socialization, defining school as the latter.

3. I recognize that assessment procedures tied to science particularly those of psychometry were created with the development of mass schooling in the United States. But the tying of reform and evaluation as a state strategy is institutionalized after World War II.

4. The impulse for reform is so powerful in the educational field that it is practically impossible to distinguish research from evaluation. The name of the current research "game" is to privilege what is thought to lead to improved school practice. Over 20 nationally funded research centers exist as part of the current effort toward school reform. A task of many of these centers is to search for exemplary schools and teacher education programs, for example, and to explicate their characteristics. The assumption is that qualities of "good" schooling can be identified and exported to other schools.

5. The work of the Umea University Group on Evaluation, led by Professor S. Franke-Wikberg, has called this approach "theoretically organized" evaluation (see, e.g., Franke-Wikberg, 1982, 1990).

6. In this project, I have worked with Sigurjon Myrdal, Jay Hammond Cradle, Seehwa Cho, and Jim Ladwig.

7. This finding is consistent with teacher socialization literature; see, e.g., Zeichner & Gore, 1990.

8. Charles Bruckerhoff (1990) discusses this phenomenon in urban settings.

9. IGE=Individually Guided Education; ICC=Instructional Coordinating Committee.

10. These theoretical concerns can be found in feminist theory, although focused upon a particular social arena. See Nicholson, 1986, and Weedon, 1987.

11. This and the following section are drawn from Popkewitz, 1990.

### *References*


Ball, D. (1988). Research on teaching mathematics: Making subject matter knowledge part of the equation (Research Report 88-2). East Lansing, MI: The National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Berger, P., Berger, B., & Kellner, H. (1973). The homeless mind: Modernization and consciousness. New York: Vintage.

Billig, M. (1982). Ideology and social psychology. Extremism, moderation and contradiction. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and symbolic power. (J. Thompson, Ed.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Homo academicus. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burrage, M., & Torstendahl, R. (Eds.). (1990). Professions in theory and history: Rethinking the study of the professions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cherryholmes, C. (1988). Power and criticism: Post-structural investigations in education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Clifford, J. (1988). The predicament of culture: Twentieth century ethnography, literature and art. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Collins, R. (1990). Changing conceptions in the sociology of the professions. In R. Torstendahl & M. Burrage (Eds.), The formation of professions: knowledge, state and strategy. London: Sage Publications.

Dreyfus, H., & Rabinow, P. (1983). Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1988). The political technology of individuals. L. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. Huttan (eds.). In Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Franke-Wikberg, S. (1982). From ideas on quality of education to ideas as quality of education. Paper presented at a conference on the Socialization Effects of Higher Education, Klagenfurt, West Germany.

Franke-Wikberg, S. (1990). The American research on educational evaluation and the national evaluation in Sweden. In M.

Granheim, M. Kogan & U. Lundgren (Eds.). (1990). Evaluation as policymaking: Introducing evaluation into a national decentralized educational system (pp. 155-171). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Giddens, A. (1987). Social theory and modern sociology. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Haskell, T. (1984). Professionalism versus capitalism: R. H. Towney, Emile Durkheim, and C. S. Pierce on the disinterestness of professional communities. In T. Haskell (Ed.), The authority of experts: Studies in history and theory (pp. 180-225), Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Kvale, S. (1990). Evaluation and decentralization of knowledge. In M. Granheim, M. Kogan & U. Lundgren (Eds.), Evaluation as policymaking: Introducing evaluation into a national decentralized educational system (pp. 119-140). London: Jessica Kingsley.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Labaree, D. (1990). Power, knowledge, and the science of teaching: A genealogy of teacher professionalization. Unpublished paper. Michigan State University, School of Education, East Lansing, MI.

Lundgren, U. (1990). Educational policy-making, decentralization and evaluation. In M. Granheim, M. Kogan & U. Lundgren (Eds.), Evaluation as policymaking: Introducing evaluation into a national decentralized educational system, London: Jessica Kingsley.

Lundgren, U. (1989). Educational research and the language of education. In D. Ball and S. Larsson (Eds.), The struggle for democratic education, equality, and participation in Sweden (pp. 191-210). New York: Falmer Press.

Lundgren, U. (1983), Between hope and happening: Text and context in curriculum. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Mattingly, P. (1987). Workplace autonomy and the reforming of teacher education. In T. Popkewitz, (Ed.), Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice (pp. 36-56). New York: Falmer.

Meyer, J. (1987). Self and Life Course: Institutionalization and Its Effects. In G. Thomas, J. Meyer, F. Ramirez, & J. Boli, (Eds.). Institutional Structure: Constituting State, Society, and the Individual (pp. 242-260). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, L. S. (1986, May 14). Nation-building and education, Education Week, p. 40.

Mills, C.W. (1959). The sociological imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1989), Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Noujain, E. (1987). History as genealogy: An exploration of Foucault's approach. In A. Griffiths, (Ed.), Contemporary French philosophy. (pp. 157-174). New York: Cambridge University Press.

O'Donnell, J. (1985). The origins of behaviorism: American psychology, 1876-1920. New York: University Press.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1991). A political sociology of educational reform: Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education, and research. New York: Teachers College Press.

Popkewitz, T. (1984). Paradigm and ideology in educational research, social functions of the intellectual. London and New York: Falmer Press.

Popkewitz, T., & Pitman, A. (1986). The idea of progress and the legitimation of state agendas: American proposals for school reform. Curriculum and Teaching, 1(1-2), 11-24.

Popkewitz, T., & Lind, K. (1989). Teachers' incentives as reform implications for teachers' work and the changing control mechanism in education. Teachers College Record, 90(4), 575-594.

Popkewitz, T., Tabachnick, B., & Wehlage, G. (1982). The myth of educational reform: A study of school responses to a program of change. Madison: University Of Wisconsin Press.

Powell, A. (1980). The uncertain profession. Harvard and the search for educational authority. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rachjman, J. (1985). Michel Foucault: The freedom of philosophy. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ross, D. (1991). The origins of American social science. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rorty, R. (1989). Contingency, Irony and Solidarity. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, B. (1987). Tracing the provenance of teacher education. In T. Popkewitz, (Ed.), Critical studies in teacher education: Its folklore, theory and practice (pp. 211-242). New York: Falmer.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 37(1), 1-22.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15(2), 4-14.

Smith, D. (1990). Conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Sykes, G. (1990). Evaluation in the context of national policy and local organization. In M. Granheim, M. Kogan & U. Lundgren (Eds.), Evaluation as policymaking: Introducing evaluation into a national decentralized educational system, London: Jessica Kingsley. (pp. 179-196)

Tom, A.R. & Valli, L. (1990). Professional knowledge for teachers. In W. Robert Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 373-392), New York: Macmillan.

Wallenstein, I. (1991). Unthinking social science: The limits of nineteenth-century paradigms. Cambridge, U.K.: Policy Press.

Weiler, H. N. (1990). Decentralization in educational governance: An exercise in contradiction? In M. Granheim, M. Kogan & U. Lundgren (Eds.), Evaluation as policymaking: Introducing evaluation into a national decentralized educational system, (pp. 42-65). London: Jessica Kingsley.

Zeichner, K. & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. Robert Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 329-348), New York: Macmillan.